

Draft of Annual Report of the COA

June 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item begins the discussion of a draft of the *Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation for 2010-11*. This draft includes a first draft of Section I of the report only.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* require the COA to provide the Commission with a report on accreditation activities on an annual basis. Typically, the two Co-Chairs present the *Annual Report* at a fall meeting of the Commission.

This agenda item begins the discussion of a draft of Section I of the *Annual Report*. Section II and II are currently being drafted and a draft of all sections of the report will be provided for discussion at the Committee's August 2011 meeting. Section II is not able to be presented at this time because it includes an overall finding of all accreditation visits and activities for 2010-11. These activities will not be completed until after this COA meeting (for example, accreditation decisions scheduled for the June 2011 meeting).

Commission staff presents Section I here in order to discuss the contents further and to ask COA members for input as to which accomplishments should be included for the 2010-11 report.

Next Steps

Commission staff will revise the draft of Section I as appropriate based on the COA discussion at this meeting. A draft of all sections of the *Annual Report of COA* will be provided to the COA for further discussion at the August 2011 COA meeting.



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Ensuring Educator Excellence

**The Committee on Accreditation's
Annual Accreditation Report to the
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2010-2011**

DRAFT

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *2010-2011 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed work plan for 2011-2012 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability, ensure high quality programs, ensure adherence to standards and foster on-going improvement. Each purpose is addressed as the report notes what was accomplished in 2010-2011 and in the proposed work plan for 2011-2012. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides more useful information and demonstrates integrity with the accreditation system.

The Committee now looks forward to maintaining the high standards set by the Commission for its accreditation responsibilities. The Committee also stands ready to assist the Commission as it considers its accreditation policies for the future.

Sincerely,

Committee Co-Chair

Gary Kinsey

Committee Co-Chair

Carol Leighty

The Committee on Accreditation

2010-2011

Joyce Abrams

Substitute Teacher/BTSA Support Provider
Chula Vista Hills Elementary School
Chula Vista Elementary School District

Ellen Curtis-Pierce

Director, Chapman University Extended
Education
Brandman University

Joseph Jimenez

BTSA Induction Cluster Regional Director
Tulare County Office of Education

Anne Jones

Director, Teacher Education Programs
University of California, Riverside

Gary Kinsey

Associate Vice President and Director
of the School of Education
California State University, Channel Islands

Kiran Kumar

Teacher, Language Arts
Pomona Unified School District

Carol Leighty

Retired Superintendent, Consultant
Temecula Valley Unified School District

Sally Plicka

BTSA Program Director
Davis Joint Unified School District

Reyes Quezada

Professor of Education
University of San Diego

Iris Riggs

Professor, Dept. of Science,
Mathematics and Technology
Education
CSU, San Bernardino

Nancy Watkins

Teacher, Valencia High School
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District,

Pia Wong

Associate Dean, College of Education
California State University, Sacramento

Committee Support Staff (Commission on Teacher Credentialing)

Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division
Cheryl Hickey, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division
Katie Croy, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Rebecca Parker, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division

Table of Contents

(To be inserted)

DRAFT

Section I:

Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2010-2011

On August 3, 2010 the Committee on Accreditation (COA) adopted the work plan for 2010-2011. Co-Chairs Nancy Watkins and Gary Kinsey presented this work plan to the Commission at the December 10, 2010 Commission meeting. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2010-2011 work plan for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession

- a) *Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings were held in public with all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were transmitted via audio broadcast and some via video webcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website was utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. The COA held meetings as follows:

August 3-4, 2010
November 5, 2010
January 20, 2011
March 17-18, 2011
April 21-22, 2011
May 25-26, 2011
June 23-24, 2011

COA meetings were broadcast live over the internet. Except where technical difficulties occurred, agenda items and the video and audio archive of the meetings are housed on the Commission website. Videoconferencing and Skyping has been used frequently in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities can participate from a videoconferencing center. This resulted in significant cost savings to the Commission.

PSD-News

The PSD E-news was developed in 2008 and was maintained on nearly a weekly basis throughout 2010-11. This electronic correspondence notifies over 300 individuals, including all approved institutions, of on-going activities related to the Professional Services Division. Information on accreditation related activities such as standards development and revision work and technical assistance workshops are routinely distributed via this communication tool.

Program Sponsor Alerts

A new type of communication was established in 2008 that supplements the PSD E-News. The Commission staff continued to use this resource frequently during the

2010-2011 year. The Program Sponsor Alert format addresses a specific issue, such as institutional responsibilities, implementation of inactive status for programs, or modification to preconditions for multiple and single subject programs. These Program Sponsor Alerts are sent via e-mail to the program contact and archived at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts.html>.

Assistance to the Field

In 2010-2011 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the revised accreditation system and its implementation. All technical assistance meetings were broadcast through the web and the audio archived for access by stakeholders: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcasts.html>. Highlights of the activities are noted in the following table:

Date	Technical Assistance Activity By Topic
July 15, 2010	2010-11 Accreditation Site Visits: Preparing for the Site Visit
Sept. 16, 2010	Program Assessment
Nov. 17, 2010	BTSA Statewide Directors Meeting - Biennial Reports
Dec. 16, 2010	Biennial Report Technical Assistance
Jan 21, 2011	Adult Education Technical Assistance
Jan 25, 2011	Title II Webcast
Jan 31, 2011	Reading Specialist Technical Assistance
Mar. 23, 2011	Single Subject Program Technical Assistance

- b) *Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2010 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-6D.pdf>). In addition, staff and Co-Chair Carol Leighty presented a comprehensive study session on accreditation to the Commission at its January 27, 2011 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-01/2011-01-2A.pdf>).
- c) *Commission Liaison.* The liaison from the Commission is invited to attend each COA meeting. The liaison participates in discussions and brings the perspective of the Commission to the COA. In addition, the liaison then reports back to the Commission on the activities of the Committee. Commission Chair Ting Sun served in this role for the Commission but has since appointed Commissioner Gahagan as liaison.
- d) *Press Releases.* After each Committee on Accreditation meeting, the Commission released notices to the media related to the Committee's accreditation decisions <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/briefing-room/default.html>

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

- a) *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is the principle, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2010-2011 academic year, accreditation site visits were held at 29 institutions. Visits were held at 9 institutions of higher education and 20 county offices of education and/or school districts. Six institutions were revisited in 2010-2011 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2010-2011 is included in Section II of this report.
- b) *Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook.* One of the major accomplishments of 2010-11 was to finalize the *Accreditation Handbook*. This document explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the Commission's accreditation system. Stakeholder review of the various chapters of the *Handbook* was completed and the document was placed on the Commission's website prior to the 2008-2009 accreditation site visits. Revisions were made clarify provisions of the Handbook prior to finalization. Chapters of the Accreditation Handbook were formally adopted at COA meetings throughout 2010, with updates made in December 2010. This document will be continually updated and revised to ensure its accuracy.
- c) *Finalize the COA Accreditation Procedures Manual*
In April of 2010 the COA adopted its revised *Procedures Manual*. This manual now reflects the current accreditation system and the exiting COA procedures. It will continue to be monitored and updated as needed.
- d) *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting.
- e) *Update members of the Board of Institutional Reviewer (BIR) so that each individual is prepared to participate in the revised accreditation system.* Staff worked with each member of the BIR who participated in initial program review, program assessment or accreditation site visits to understand the Commission's accreditation system, the revised Common Standards and Glossary, the use of the Common Standard Descriptors, the Program Assessment process, and the revised site visit format.

In addition, in preparation for the 2010-11 accreditation site visits, the Commission scheduled accreditation updates via webinar format. These webinars were required for all BIR members participating as site visit reviewers this past year. Webinars were specific to the roles on the accreditation site visit team. Webinars were held for Common Standards, NCATE Unit Standards, and Program Sampling team members. Staff reviewed the procedures for the reviews and discussed important updates such as report formats, schedule changes, focus of interviews, credential programs

transitioning to newly adopted standards, and other such critically important matters in preparation for their roles as team members.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

- a) *Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. A list of all credential programs approved in the 2010-11 year is included in Section II of this report.
- b) *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* Institutions in the Red cohort have/will complete the program assessment process, while those in the Violet cohort began the process. Those programs which have completed or begun program assessment in 2010-11 are included in Appendix A.
- c) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Review teams conducted technical assistance visits to two institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit in the future. A list of institutions that hosted a technical assistance site visit in the 2010-11 year is included in Section II.
- d) *Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* The plan for the 2010-11 year included the dissemination of the Common Standard descriptors which were intended to facilitate a more consistent understanding of, and agreement about, the Common Standards. However, feedback from reviewers suggested that the Common Standards descriptors as drafted would not facilitate a better understanding of the Common Standard. As a result, the COA rescinded its adoption of the Common Standards descriptors and will continue to review this possibility in the 2011-12 year.
- e) *Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction Programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. During the 2010-11 year, staff assisted Cluster Region Directors in preparing and executing accreditation site visits to school districts and county offices of education. All approved induction programs participated fully in program assessment, biennial reports, and site visits in accordance with their particular cohort schedule of accreditation activities.
- f) *Continue the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* The Commission took action in fall 2006 that all programs that lead to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system, the subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the

accreditation system. In 2010, the Commission revised the Standards Common to All, that are required for all subject matter programs. These were streamlined in an effort to remove unnecessary barriers for potential program sponsors. However, the subject matter programs remain outside of the continuing accreditation process. Because of other more critical priorities at this time and limited resources, staff believes that further discussion of this topic can take place during 2010-11, but action on moving these into the accreditation process would likely not occur until 2012-13 when the full phase in of all Phase II subject matter programs is complete.

- g) *Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. Among the changes that were recommended by the UAC were 1) the development of a specific subgroup of program assessment reviewers that are solely focused on the TPA related standards; 2) the development of TPA focused questions for program reviewers; and 3) identification of sources of information for site visit reviewers to consider. In 2010, the Commission staff implemented these changes. A separate program assessment subgroup was identified of individuals who were both BIR trained and experts in the teaching performance assessment models. These individuals began reviewing the program responses to standard related to the TPA, thereby ensuring a minimum level of expertise and ensuring greater consistency in reviews for these standards across institutions. In addition, the tools developed to assist these reviewers and the site visit teams were used for the first time in 2010-11 and will continue to be updated and enhanced as needed.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

- a) *Collect, analyze, and report on biennial reports submitted in fall 2010.* The 2010-2011 academic year was the fourth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in three of the seven cohorts (Orange, Blue and Violet) were required to submit candidate competence and performance data in their biennial reports in the fall of 2010. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports is included in Appendix A. The CTC feedback form was modified for institutions submitting in fall 2010 in order to more clearly indicate beneficial aspects of the biennial report that tied to the
- b) *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Staff and the COA continued to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. An on-line evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit continued to be used successfully. A major focus was providing assistance to institutions as they prepared their biennial reports, both through on-site meetings and webcasts. In addition, staff reviewed several aspects of the accreditation system. For instance, an agenda item looked at program assessment and how standards less than fully aligned at this point

were related to standards findings at the conclusion of the site visit. Additional aspects of the accreditation site visit will continue to be reviewed.

- c) *Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. The Partnership Agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) expires in 2012. The Commission has participated fully in the pilot of the NCATE continuous improvement model as well transformational initiative model (first institution to be reviewed in fall 2011). In addition, the Commission conducted its first joint CTC/TEAC accreditation visit in 2010-11 (*see d below*).

With the merging of NCATE and TEAC into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Commission anticipates reviewing a new protocol. NCATE and TEAC have requested states to begin the process of developing new protocols with the unified entity. Therefore, in the coming months, the COA will begin discussion of the development of a California CAEP protocol.

- d) *Develop an agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* The COA took action in January 2010 to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. The agreement is for two years and one institution, Chapman University, had a joint site visit in February 2011. The COA continued to monitor the agreement both before and after this first review to ensure that the process is efficient and effective. The COA completed the alignment matrix which identifies which concepts in the Commission's Common Standards were addressed by the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards of Program Capacity and which concepts were not explicitly addressed.
- e) *Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* Staff continued to work with stakeholders on an alignment with the American Speech-Language- Hearing Association (ASHA) standards to the Commission's adopted Speech-Language Pathology program standards. In November of 2010, the COA adopted an alignment matrix which allowed programs sponsored by California institutions to submit a program proposal using the ASHA standards and addressing the concepts from the California standards that have been identified as not present in the ASHA standards.

General Operations

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This included the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, orientation of new members, and modification the *Accreditation Handbook*.

DRAFT